

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

FRANCISCO RAMOS-JIMENEZ,

Plaintiff

v.

UNITED STATES, et al.,

Defendants

No. 3:22cv799

(Judge Munley)

**ORDER**

AND NOW, to wit, this 6<sup>th</sup> day of March 2024, before the court for disposition is Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson's report and recommendation, which proposes the dismissal of plaintiff's complaint with prejudice for failure to prosecute. (Doc. 17). No objections to the report and recommendation have been filed, and the time for such filing has passed. Therefore, in deciding whether to adopt the report and recommendation, the court must determine if a review of the record evidences plain error or manifest injustice. FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b) 1983 Advisory Committee Notes ("When no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record to accept the recommendation"); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Sullivan v. Cuyler, 723 F.2d 1077, 1085 (3d Cir. 1983).

After a careful review, the court finds neither a clear error on the face of the record nor a manifest injustice, and therefore, the report and recommendation shall be adopted. It is hereby **ORDERED** as follows:

1) The magistrate judge's report and recommendation (Doc. 17) is

**ADOPTED;**

2) The plaintiff's complaint (Doc. 1) is **DISMISSED** with prejudice for failure to prosecute; and

3) The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

**BY THE COURT:**



**JUDGE JULIA K. MUNLEY**  
**United States District Court**